IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.8593 OF 2005

Vanita Anil Kripalani .. Petitioner

Vs.

Anil Parsuram Kripalani ..Respondent

Mr.Rajiv Narula with Mr.Dhaval D.Mehta i/b M/s.Jhangiani Narula and Associates for the petitioner

Ms.Manjula Rao for the respondent

CORAM : S.U.KAMDAR, J
DATED : 22ND DECEMBER, 2005

P.C.:

. The present petition challenges the order dt.14.9.05 only in so far as interim maintenance for the petitioner was not considered by the Trial Court. In the circumstances of the present case, I am of the opinion that the learned Judge cannot refuse to consider an application for interim maintenance. In that view of the matter, trial court is directed to decide the interim maintenance for wife on or before 31.1.06. Interim maintenance granted to the daughter is not disturbed and the same is confirmed. Petitioner is also challenging

the order dt.20.10.05 passed in the Interim Application No.80 of 2004. I have perused the order. I find no infirmity with the order passed by the Trial Court. Documents on which respondent has relied upon, copies are already furnished. In that light of the matter, there is no substance in challenge to the order passed by the Trial Court on 20.10.05. The said order is therefore confirmed. Petition partly succeeds and application for interim maintenance is directed to be decided by the trial court as above.